		ELECTRONICALLY FILED January 25, 2007
1		SHEA & CARLYON, LTD.
2	(CA State Bar No. 136934)	JAMES PATRICK SHEA (Nevada State Bar No. 000405)
3		CANDACE C. CARLYON (Nevada State Bar No. 002666)
4	ANDREW M. PARLEN S (CA State Bar No. 230429).	SHLOMO S. SHERMAN Nevada State Bar No. 009688)
5	1901 Avenue of the Stars, 12th Floor	228 South Fourth Street, First Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
6	Telephone: (310) 228-5600	Telephone: (702) 471-7432
	Email: <u>fmerola@stutman.com</u> E	Facsimile: (702) 471-7435 Email: <u>jshea@sheacarlyon.com</u>
7	ekarasik@stutman.com aparlen@stutman.com	ccarlyon@sheacarlyon.com ssherman@sheacarlyon.com
8	Counsel for the Official Committee Of Equity Security Holders Of USA Capital First Trust I	
9	_	·
10	UNITED STATES BANKE DISTRICT OF N	
11	In re:	) BK-S-06-10725-LBR
12	USA COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE COMPANY,  Debtor.	) Chapter 11 )
13	In re: USA CAPITAL REALTY ADVISORS, LLC,	BK-S-06-10726-LBR
14	Debtor.	Chapter 11
15	In re:   USA CAPITAL DIVERSIFIED TRUST DEED FUN	) BK-S-06-10727-LBR ID, LLC, ) Chapter 11
16	Debtor.	
17	In re: USA CAPITAL FIRST TRUST DEED FUND, LLC,	S
	Debtor.	<u> </u>
18	In re: USA SECURITIES, LLC,	) BK-S-06-10729-LBR ) Chapter 11
19	Debtor.	)
20	Affects	Š
21	☐ All Debtors ☐ USA Commercial Mortgage Co.	Date: January 24, 2007 Time: 3:30 p.m.
22	USA Securities, LLC	)
23	USA Capital Realty Advisors, LLC USA Capital Diversified Trust Deed	}
24	USA First Trust Deed Fund, LLC	
25	DECLARATION OF MATTHEW KVARDA IN PURSUANT TO BANKRUPTCY CODE SECT	
	CONFIRMED DEBTORS' THIRD AMENDE	ED JOINT CHAPTER 11 PLAN OF
26	REORGANIZATION AS IT RELATES TO AI (AFFECTS DEBTORS USA COMMERCIAL I	
27	CAPITAL FIRST TRUST D	
28		

1

5 6 7

9

10

11

8

12 13 14

15

16

17 18 19

21 22

20

23

24

25 26

27

28

I, Matthew Kvarda, declare as follows:

- 1. I am a managing director of Alvarez & Marsal, LLC, financial and real estate advisors to the Official Committee of Equity Security Holders of USA Capital First Trust Deed Fund, LLC (the "FTDF Committee"). I submit this Declaration in support of the "Motion For Order Pursuant To Bankruptcy Code Sections 1141 And 1142 To Enforce Confirmed Debtors' Third Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan Of Reorganization As It Relates To Allocation Of Sale Proceeds" (the "Motion") filed by the FTDF Committee.
- 2. The following facts are personally known to me and/or based on my personal observations. If called to testify thereto, I could and would do so, under oath.
- 3. In connection with the above-captioned cases (the "Chapter 11 Cases"), I and the members of the engagement team have worked closely with the members of the FTDF Committee and its other professionals regarding the development of a workable exit strategy which maximized the potential return to investors in USA Capital First Trust Deed Fund, LLC (the "FTDF"). These efforts include assisting in the formulation of the "Debtors' Third Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization" (the "Plan").
- 4. The Bid Procedures (a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "1") approved by the Court pursuant to an order entered November 8, 2006 were carefully crafted and negotiated such that all overbids and overbid increments would be made to the "Total Asset Purchase Price," which as defined in the purchase agreement with SPCP Group, LLC (the "Stalking Horse Bidder") included the combined price for both the FTDF and USACM assets to be sold. Further, the Bid Procedures provided that qualified bidders must purchase "at least the same Property being purchased in the Purchase Agreement." Bid Procedures, Section 3(iv). Thus, the Bid Procedures anticipated that additional assets could be sold at the Auction with the Allocation remaining unchanged despite any increased asset pool. The primary purpose of these negotiated terms was to prevent bidders from attempting to artificially allocate their bid in an effort to gain additional support from one or the other estate.

408152v2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein have the meaning set forth in the Motion.

5. The issue of requiring that overbids be made on the Total Asset
Purchase Price rather than separately on the FTDF and USA Commercial Mortgage Company
("USACM") assets, respectively, was of such importance that the Bid Procedures approved by
the Court specifically precluded bidders from attempting to allocate the division of the total
asset purchase price at the Auction. Footnote 1 of the Bid Procedures states:

To clarify, during the Auction, bidders shall make Increased Bids with respect to the Total Asset Purchase Price and shall not allocate any Overbid Increment, including the Minimum Incremental Overbid, between the First Trust Deed Property and the Commercial Mortgage Property. The allocation of any such Overbid Increment, including the Minimum Incremental Overbid, shall be made in accordance with the terms of the Plan or subsequent order of the Bankruptcy Court.

Without such a provision the FTDF Committee feared that the Official Unsecured Creditors' Committee for USA Commercial Mortgage Company (the "USACM Committee") might try to maneuver a play for more money then as negotiated between the parties and, accordingly, required that the Bid Procedures provide that overbids must be made on the Total Asset Purchase Price and not separately on the assets of FTDF and USACM. Given the present dispute over the Allocation, it appears that the FTDF Committee's concerns were not unfounded.

6. On November 15, 2006, the Debtors filed the Plan. The Plan provides for the approval of the Sale to the Stalking Horse Bidder, subject to the Auction. The Plan also includes several key compromises, including a compromise between USACM and FTDF (the "Compromise"). An integral component of the Compromise was the agreement between USACM and FTDF as to the allocation of any overbid sale proceeds. Section IV(E)(2)(i) of the Plan provides that:

The Overbid Allocation shall be 85% to FTDF and 15% to USACM for any overbid consideration, and any incurred break-up fee or expense reimbursement obligation (as those terms are used in the Asset Purchase Agreement) shall be allocated in the same percentages, except as otherwise provided in the Stipulation memorializing the agreement between USACM and FTDF on the Overbid Allocation filed by the USACM Committee and the FTDF Committee with the Court, under seal, and served on the Debtors as confidential information, no later than ten (10) days prior to the Auction.

- 7. While neither the Sale nor the Plan Effective Date has occurred as of the date this Motion is filed, I believe these events are imminent.
- 8. The stalking horse bid at the Auction provided cash consideration of \$46 million for the FTDF assets being sold and up to approximately \$550,000 for the USACM assets being sold. While an allocation based on asset value would have resulted in values of approximately 99% to FTDF and 1% to USACM, in the spirit of compromise and in good faith, the FTDF Committee agreed to the 85% to FTDF and 15% to USACM provided for in the Allocation in the Plan.
- 9. Prior to the Auction, Compass submitted an initial overbid under which the proposed purchase price was \$48 million for the FTDF assets and \$8 million for the USACM assets, subject to adjustment (the "Initial Compass Bid"). Compass elected to purchase additional assets of USACM other than those that were included in the Stalking Horse's bid, including all accrued fees and default interest due to USACM as of the close of the Sale.

  Compass' successful bid at the Auction resulted in an overbid of approximately \$11 million.
- apply to all overbid proceeds, including the approximately \$10 million in additional value contained in the Initial Compass Bid, at the Auction, the FTDF Committee, again in good faith, and with the understanding that the Allocation would otherwise apply to the Auction proceeds, agreed that USACM would retain the \$8 million from the Initial Compass Bid (and the FTDF would retain the additional \$2 million from the Initial Compass Bid). Application of the Allocation to the increased bid amount would have resulted in \$6.8 million in additional sale proceeds being paid to FTDF, rather than USACM, which is a significant transfer of value already made voluntarily by the FTDF.
- 11. While the USACM Committee did not consent to this arrangement, the straight percentage allocation on the total \$56 million Initial Compass Bid is 14% to USACM (\$8 million out of \$56 million) and 86% to FTDF (\$48 million out of \$56 million), which is, but for only an 1% difference, the same as the Allocation in the Plan.
  - 12. The Allocation dispute only applies to all overbid proceeds in excess of

408152v2

the Initial Compass Bid. The overbid proceeds at issue are approximately \$9.5 million, after deduction of the \$1.5 million Break-Up Fee and Expense Reimbursement payable to the Stalking Horse Bidder. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Alvarez & Marsal, LLC Financial and real estate advisor to the Official Committee of Equity Security Holders of USA Capital First Trust Deed Fund, LLC 

408152v2